

CALIFORNIA CHILDREN AND FAMILIES COMMISSION

Advisory Committee on Diversity

MINUTES

June 29, 2001

Library Tsakopoulos Galleria

828 I Street, Sacramento

Committee members present:

Commissioner Sandra Gutierrez, Co-Chair

Commissioner Lou Vismara, Co-Chair

Maysee Yang

Portia Choi

Rafaela Frausto

Reinaldo Galindo

Whitcomb Hayslip

Alan Watahara Carlene Davis

Donna Michelson Guadalupe

Alonzo Margaret Yonekura Kate Warren

CCFC Staff:

Jane Henderson

Emily Nahat

Barbara Marquez

Roberta Peck

Judy Stucki

Jennifer Bell

I Welcome and Introductions

Louis Vismara and Sandra Gutierrez convened the Advisory Committee on Diversity meeting of June 29, 2001 at 9:30 A.M. They welcomed all participants and thanked the committee members for their hard work and accomplishments since the last meeting. Ms. Gutierrez explained that by the end of the meeting it is intended that the Diversity Principles, the Glossary of Definitions and the Vision Statement be adopted as well as have the committee members providing input regarding the School Readiness Request for Funding (RFF).

II Approve 2-day Planning Meeting Summary Report (April 30-May 1, 2001)

Sandra Gutierrez referred the members to the Summary Report and asked for approval, including incorporating comment received regarding the *Summary of Agreements* item contained in the report.

A motion was made to adopt the Summary Report as amended; it was seconded and approved by the committee without dissent.

III Approve Minutes from the March 29, 2001 meeting

A motion was made to approve the minutes of the March 29, 2001 meeting. It was seconded and approved without dissent to adopt the minutes.

IV Committee Infrastructure

Louis Vismara referenced a one-page matrix that identifies issues related to committee infrastructure. He asked the group to review and implement in concept the processes contained within the document after determining that it accurately reflects what was agreed upon at the Planning meeting. Jane Henderson noted that this matrix would be an evolving document that the committee will add to and subtract from it as necessary.

Whitcomb Hayslip suggested that the committee should consider additional contracts with providers other than San Francisco and Sonoma State University to look at issues that are related to critical components of diversity.

IV A. Vision Statement

Barbara Marquez reviewed the development of the Vision Statement and explained that the spirit of the three separate vision statements previously developed, had been combined into one. Committee members commented upon the wording used in several areas of the vision statement.

There was substantial comment provided by the members on recommended changes to the Vision Statement. Jane Henderson and Louis Vismara stated that the changes suggested would be incorporated into the revised version of the document.

Sandra Gutierrez noted that there agreement among the members on the desired changes to the Vision Statement and that it is important for this document to be forwarded to the Commission in July. Sandra Gutierrez stated that if the Committee feels comfortable it could approve the vision statement in concept and allow staff and the co-chairs to approve a final version before it goes to the Commission.

Kate Warren stated that the committee could not move forward on anything until a decision is made regarding the vision statement and the refinement of issues and principles contained within it. Kate Warren stated that the document would be its strongest if it goes to the Commission in July and that the Committee needs to vote on it today. Alan Watahara expressed his support for an interim vote and pointed out that the Committee does in fact have a quorum. Donna Michelson stated she wants to go on record as being against the approval of the document at this time.

Public Comment:

- Amy Ling Tan discussed two items she would like to see reflected in the document, Family structures and geographic areas.
- Cheryl Allen commented upon the sentence “and children with disabilities and other special needs.” She stated that when one reads this in the vision statement it seems to separate children into two different types—children with disabilities and children without. She stated the vision

statement should be worded so that it is reflective of all children and does not distinguish one from another.

Motion: Kate Warren made a motion to adopt the concepts embodied in the draft vision statement and accept it for approval with the understanding that committee recommendations, comments and discussion will be incorporated into the document. Portia Choi seconded the motion to approve.

Jane Henderson asked Barbara Marquez to read off the committee recommendations regarding the modifications that will be made to the statements. Barbara Marquez indicated where and what changes will be made to the document according to her notes. Louis Vismara put the item to a vote, which passed with eleven in favor to approve and two abstentions. (Michelson and Davis)

Sandra Gutierrez thanked the committee for all the hard work putting forth ideas and revising this document. She stated that she wants all of the comments on the document including those related to grammar and how items could be better stated. She said the comments can be given directly to Barbara Marquez.

IV B Diversity Principles (Equity Principles)

The committee reviewed the Diversity Principles that have been developed by the Diversity Principles Workgroup. The committee members made suggestions and provided comment on the document.

Sandra Gutierrez noted that all the members seemed to have found common ground and have reached consensus regarding the Diversity Principles. She also suggested renaming the document to Equity Principles. There was consensus on the name changes.

Motion: Rafaela Frausto made a motion to accept the Equity Principles with the changes that make it consistent with the Vision Statement. The motion was put to a vote and it was approved to adopt the Equity Principles without dissent.

Louis Vismara thanked Donna Michelson, Diane Visencio, and the others on the Principles Workgroup for their contributions to the document.

V School Readiness

V. B. CCFC School Readiness Centers/Programs (item 5b taken out of order)

Jane Henderson introduced Roberta Peck who made a PowerPoint presentation that provided an update on the CCFC School Readiness Centers/Program Initiative and the Request for Funding under development. The committee discussed key policy issues and questions pertinent to diversity, disabilities, and equity.

Roberta Peck walked the committee through the process, recommendations and implementation issues staff has developed. She described the planning groups that were divided into the following four sub-groups:

- ? Fiscal
- ? Criteria/Eligibility
- ? Evaluation
- ? Technical Assistance

She stated that the representatives on these groups include County Commissioners and Executive Directors, Advisory Committee on Diversity members, CCFC Staff, and some of the foundation partners. She advised the committee of the “Launch” timeline which is as follows:

- Tier 1 RFF out August 2001
 Start November 2001
- Tier 2 Intent to participate – December 2001
 RFF out December 2001
 Start July 2002
- Tier 3 RFF out December 2002
 Start July 2003

Fiscal Subgroup recommendations were presented which included the following:

- ? State funds will follow an allocation process that is based on a formula that blends birth rate data, and the number of students in the academic deciles of 1 - 3 to ensure Counties will not have to compete against each other.
- ? Implementation grants for County Commissions and County matching funds.

Ms. Peck discussed Target communities as well as School Readiness principles and processes in general. Five essential and coordinated elements for School Readiness were identified as follows:

- ? Children’s readiness for school
- ? Parenting/Family support
- ? Health and Social Services
- ? School’s readiness for children
- ? Site infrastructure, evaluation, and administration

She explained that the Criteria/Eligibility subgroup have drafted documents to support the principles, the processes, and the five essential elements of school readiness. She stated that the Evaluation sub-group is working to develop an evaluation contract RFP and described its deliverables. Ms. Peck described the Technical Assistance sub-group recommendations, which were provided to the Committee members in a document. She stated that it is planned to have a draft RFF available for review and approval by the State Commissioners at their July 19 meeting.

Ms. Peck asked the committee members to provide input as a whole group on the following items:

- School Readiness RFP
- Technical Assistance Tools and Strategies
- Partners and Resources
- Promising Practices and Standards
- Research Questions and Data
- Other Issues

The Committee input included the following comments:

- Louis Vismara explained that the State Commission has a responsibility when awarding grants to look over the local applications to be sure the recommendations have been followed.
- Donna Michelson recommended that the local Commissions are provided with orientation and education regarding what the State Commission and prop.10 is all about. She stated that it is very difficult for the people working under the local commissions to implement anything if local Commissioners do not understand Prop.10.
- Alan Watahara expressed concern over the State's capacity to provide oversight and recommended that in regard to the public relations and education campaigns to focus on the empowerment and education of the local communities as opposed to local Commissions.
- Margaret Yonekura suggested that the State could provide skilled facilitators that could draw people from the audience to ensure a more inclusive process.
- Rafaela Frausto recommended interviewing the collaborators on RFF's to find out how much they were really able to participate in the process.
- Sandra Gutierrez said that the staff can now work with key members of the advisory group especially in relation to children with disabilities and special needs and that there is a need for follow up on the issue of English learners in terms of school readiness.

Jane Henderson stated that the evaluation of collaborator participation should be built into the evaluation process. Jane Henderson advised that the long-range strategy is to get a significant infusion of general fund dollars because revenue sources are declining. She asked for any additional recommendations and comments on technical assistance and policy issues to be provided as soon as possible to Roberta Peck.

Public Comment: Denise Stromberg stated that it is critical to require the involvement of early care and education providers because there are an exceptionally large number of children in childcare and their providers need to be adequately represented.

Kate Ryan recommended that the people and entities that currently assess children for special needs as well as those that work with the special needs children be invited to the table.

Cathy Simpson stated that parent groups as community representatives are very important in this process and she recommended the inclusion of parents with disabilities.

V. A. Communication Coordination

Jane Henderson described how the exchange of information, materials and updates will be coordinated between the Advisory Committee on Diversity and other groups that are working on School Readiness (e.g., Master Plan Workgroup, School Readiness Planning Groups, etc.). She provided a document to the Committee Members entitled *Advisory Committee on Diversity Assignments* that lists which of the Advisory Committee on Diversity Members are represented on each of the workgroups. She explained how the Committee members' representation on the various workgroups is the most effective means for cross-fertilization and communication. She stated that all of the meeting agendas are posted to give advanced notice, all minutes, work products and advanced drafts of documents are shared among the various groups and Commission members and, cross functional teams at Staff level have been organized to ensure coordination.

V. 5. Master Plan for Education/Workgroup on School Readiness

Judy Stucki provided an update on the Master Plan Workgroup and recommended visiting the website to review the *Draft Table of Contents* as well as the *Statement of Principles* that the Master Plan group has been working on. She stated that additional documents will be continually posted as they are developed.

Alan Watahara explained that he and his teammates agreed on the following items:

- The importance of diligence in being spokespersons for the Committee and the Co-Chairs.
- To make sure to speak as representatives of the Committee as opposed to individuals.
- To send out information rapidly to receive feedback promptly.
- To understand that there are on going discussions and activities by seven sub-committees that will be assembled together into a Master Plan.

V. D. Operational Plan for School Readiness

Barbara Marquez reviewed the Operation Plan for School Readiness document and highlighted previous discussions regarding communication coordination, the report on the Master Plan, work under development, and School Readiness. She stated that one item to be added to the document is the consultant assistance task.

Donna Michelson inquired about the status of the UCLA School Readiness interview results. Jane Henderson responded that UCLA is about one half of the way through and the results will be shared as soon as they are available.

VI. Media/Public Education

Nicole Kasabian discussed several projects and processes for soliciting and coordinating input from the Advisory Committee on various media/public education products. Some of the highlights of her presentation were as follows:

- She invited Committee members Alan Watahara and Portia Choi to join her group in monthly discussions regarding communication projects with the County Association of Executive Directors. She stated that additional committee member participation would be helpful on larger projects.
- The *Kit for New Parents* will be released in English and Spanish sometime in September.
- Additional cultural adaptation of the kit will be forthcoming.
- The development of the next installment of the advertising campaign is underway and is in need of the Advisory Committee to serve as part of its stakeholder group for the review of advertisements (late July – early August 2001).
- The Community Based Outreach Program is on the verge of being organized.
- Two to four Advisory Committee members are needed to serve on the Advisory Committee for the Community and Public Outreach Program.

Martha Arevalo of the public education team of Rogers and Associates provided the Committee with an update on *Reaching California: A Communication Action Guide*. She outlined sections of the guide and explained what groups helped develop each section. She stated that her team is working with Sonoma State University who is providing consulting and expertise in the area of special needs and disabilities outreach. Ms. Arevalo asked for Advisory Committee on Diversity assistance to review data and provide recommendations to ensure that the guide is complete before it is finalized.

Sandra Gutierrez noted that there were some serious missteps in the development of the Communication guide and reiterated that the guide is still in draft form. Martha Arevalo stated that the guide would not be released until it is completely developed. Louis Vismara stated that this product had been developed without appropriate input on issues specific to disabilities. Ms. Kasabian and Ms. Arevalo stated that they recognize that there is need for improvement in this area and that they are taking steps to address the concerns raised.

V. Children with Disabilities and other Special Needs Initiatives

Dr. Tony Apolloni from the California Institute on Human Services/Sonoma State University presented a proposed process for creating a strategic plan for Proposition 10 related to children with disabilities and other special needs.

Dr. Apolloni presented recommended outcomes for the process as follows:

- A futuristic vision statement.
- Strategic goals
- Action plans
- Committee input on the following items:
 - Composition of the strategic planning and action plan.
 - Background materials
 - Givens
 - Plan process/outcomes
 - Development timeline

He also described strategic planning and management, its major benefits and recommended planning approaches that must be approved by the Proposition 10 Commission, and discussed the establishment of “givens” and some likely examples. He described stakeholders and the importance of stakeholder analysis, which included a listing of ideal characteristics of stakeholders, invited to serve on the Strategic Plan Committee. Dr. Apolloni outlined a process to determine and develop background materials to be shared with the planning group. He proposed holding a two day strategic planning retreat to define the vision and strategic goals of the Proposition 10 Commission relative to children with disabilities as well as the creation of action plans and elements that should be present in the final report.

Ann Carr distributed a nomination form as well as the criteria for nomination of individuals to serve on the Strategic Planning Group.

Some of the Committee discussion on strategic alliances and who should be involved as stakeholders is as follows:

- Carlene Davis explained that within the stakeholder groups are entities that do not necessarily deal directly with the issues, yet it is very important for them to be involved in the educational process because they have the ability to wield significant influence. She stated as an example that one strategic alliance in early childcare education might be employers because employer sponsored childcare might be a goal.
- Whitcomb Hayslip suggested that a mistake has been made in regards to identifying the early childhood administrators and early childcare programs as “those have a lot of experience with disabilities”. He stated there is also a need to be involved with the programs that do not have a strong experience with disability in the early childhood community. He recommended removing the additional qualifiers and talking about the early childhood community in a more generic sense to obtain a more representative set of stakeholders.

- Kate Warren recommended that parents have input on whom they perceive as primary decision-makers and stakeholders in these systems. She said there are good people at the street level with great ideas and experience that need to be involved in the process.

IV. D. Committee Infrastructure--Meeting Schedule (out of order)

Barbara Marquez stated that the regular meeting date for the Advisory Committee on Diversity is set as the fourth Monday of every other month starting in September 2001.

IV. E. Diversity Glossary (out of order)

Sandra Gutierrez asked for input on the glossary.

Whitcomb Hayslip recommended that a section be changed under Disabilities. He said the first two items under *Children 3 – 5* are still in the education code but they have become obsolete due to more recent legislation and those two factors are not looked at any longer in terms of eligibility. The two items to be deleted are as follows:

- “Having a significant delay in one developmental area.”
- “Having a moderate delay in two developmental areas.”

Cheryl Allen recommended the use of the Americans with Disabilities Act definition of disabilities in certain areas of the glossary.

Sandra Gutierrez suggested that the Committee amend the glossary to reflect Ms. Allen’s recommendations.

A motion was made to adopt the glossary with the changes; it was seconded and approved to adopt the glossary with one abstention.

Sandra Gutierrez invited all the Committee Members to attend the State Commission meeting in Los Angeles on July 19th where the Equity Principles, the Vision and the Glossary will be presented as a discussion agenda item.

VIII. Announcements

Jennifer Bell provided a brief update on the annual statewide conference, which included the following information:

- March 20th 2002 - Pre-conference
- March 21st – 22nd - Conference
- Location – Hyatt Regency / Mission Bay, San Diego
- Projected attendance – 600

IX. Adjournment 3:35 p.m.